

RECEIVED
MAY - 3 1993

IN ARBITRATION BEFORE
ROBERT J. MUELLER

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Interest
Arbitration Between

CITY OF GREENFIELD

DECISION & AWARD

INT/ARB-6384

and

Decision No. 27399-A

TEAMSTERS "GENERAL" LOCAL
NO. 200 (RESIDUAL EMPLOYEES)

APPEARANCES:

Michael, Best & Fredrich, Attorneys at Law, by MR. ROBERT W. MULCAHY, for the City.

Previant, Goldberg, Uelmen, Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C., Attorneys at Law, by MS. MARIANNE GOLDSTEIN ROBBINS, for the Union.

INTRODUCTION:

The union gained recognition to represent the employees in the subject bargaining unit in 1989. A contract was negotiated that carried through 1990. Negotiations on a successor contract failed to result in voluntary agreement. On February 21, 1992, the union filed a petition with the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission wherein it alleged an impasse had been reached between the parties. The undersigned was subsequently appointed to serve as arbitrator to determine and resolve the dispute pursuant to the provisions of Sec. 111.70 of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. A hearing was held in the City of Greenfield on January 18, 1993. The parties were present at the hearing and were afforded full opportunity to present such evidence, testimony and arguments as they deemed relevant. Post hearing briefs were exchanged directly between the parties. Reply briefs were filed and exchanged through the arbitrator on March 11, 1993.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

SECTION 111.70(4) (cm) 7 of the WISCONSIN STATUTES

provides as follows:

- "(7) 'Factors considered.' In making any decision under the arbitration procedures authorized by this paragraph, the arbitrator shall give weight to the following factors:
- a. The lawful authority of the municipal employer.
 - b. Stipulations of the parties.
 - c. The interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet the costs of any proposed settlement.
 - d. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services.
 - e. Comparison of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees generally in public employment in the same community and in comparable communities.
 - f. Comparison of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees in private employment in the same community and in comparable communities.
 - g. The average consumer prices for goods and services, commonly known as the cost-of-living.
 - h. The overall compensation presently received by the municipal employees, including direct wage compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance and pension, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received.
 - i. Changes in any of the foregoing circumstances during the pendency of the arbitration proceedings.
 - j. Such other factors not confined to the foregoing, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours, and conditions of employment through voluntary collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration or otherwise between the parties, in the public service or in the private employment."

THE FINAL OFFERS OF THE PARTIES:

Subsequent to the hearing, the parties resolved an issue involving "Automobile Allowance". Such issue is therefore removed from this arbitration.

The final offers of the parties were as follows:

1. Article 13 - Sick Leave, Section D. Retirement Pay:

City final offer:

Revise the last sentence of Section D. Retirement Pay, so that Section D reads as follows:

"At the time of retirement an employee shall be paid in cash fifty percent (50%) of his/her accumulated unused sick leave not to exceed **thirty-seven and one-half (37-1/2) days with pay, at their regular hourly rate of pay.** Such retirement gratuity shall not be paid in the event of termination of employment or for any other reason than retirement.

"This accumulation requires fifteen (15) years of continuous service and retirement under the Wisconsin Retirement System without actuarially reduced benefits. Upon death the retirement pay will be paid to the beneficiary, or estate."

Union final offer:

In Section D. Retirement Pay, revise the first sentence so that Section D reads as follows:

"At the time of retirement, an employee shall be paid in cash fifty percent (50%) of his/her accumulated unused sick leave not to exceed **fifty (50) days maximum, at their regular rate of pay.** Upon death the retirement gratuity will be paid to the beneficiary, or estate. Such retirement gratuity shall not be paid in the event of termination of employment for any reason other than retirement. **This accumulation requires five (5) years continuous service.**"

2. Article 25 - Miscellaneous, Section B. Uniform Allowance:

City final offer:

B. Uniform Allowance:

Revise the last sentence in the first paragraph as follows:

"The uniform allowance shall be issued by the second pay period in January."

Union final offer:

The uniform allowance shall be issued with the first payroll check of the new year.

3. Appendix A1-Wage Schedule:

City final offer:

Effective January 1, 1991 - 4.25% across-the-board increase

Effective January 1, 1992 - 4.0% across-the-board increase

Union final offer:

Wage Schedule: Effective January 1, 1991, four and one quarter percent (4- $\frac{1}{4}$ %) increase to all classifications.

Effective January 1, 1991, the Environmental Health Specialist salary to equal the Public Health Nurse salary.

Effective January 1, 1992, four percent (4%) increase to all classifications.

Effective December 31, 1992, lump sum base adjustments as follows added to the current rate:

Assistant City Engineer	\$1,500.00
Assistant Building Inspector	\$2,000.00
Engineering Technician	\$1,500.00
Plumbing Inspector	\$1,250.00
Code Enforcement Officer	\$.40/per hour
Environmental Health Specialist	\$ 500.00
Public Health Nurse	\$ 500.00
Deputy City Assessor	\$ 500.00

DISCUSSION:

WAGE SCHEDULE ISSUE:

As can be seen from the final offers, the proposed general increase for each of the two years of the contract is identical. Each party proposes a 4.25% increase for calendar year 1991 and 4.0% increase for calendar year 1992. The sole dispute between the parties involving wages involves the union's proposal to increase the salary of the Environmental Health Specialist to that of the Public Health Nurse effective 1/1/91. The sole issue between the parties

involving wages for 1992 involves the union's proposal for what will hereinafter be referred to as "catch-up" increases to be placed into effect on 12/31/92 for all but two of the classifications in the bargaining unit. The union's proposal omits any proposed catch-up for the classifications of City Accountant and Police Department Utility Person.

CATCH-UP ISSUE:

The various arguments presented by the parties will be briefly identified in this section and will be more fully described in the DISCUSSION section following.

The union contends an analysis of comparable communities supports the need for catch-up increases for the classifications indicated in the union's final proposal. Secondly, the union argues that their catch-up proposal is substantially the same as the one the parties had agreed to during bargaining. It therefore represents the agreement that the parties would otherwise have voluntarily reached had they continued bargaining to a final agreement. The union further argues that their catch-up proposal is supported by the actions of the city with respect to the way it has granted catch-up increases to a number of other professional and higher level unrepresented positions. Of approximately 19 unrepresented positions, 6 were granted additional catch-up increases above the across-the-board increases provided to all others since 1991.

The city contends its final offer maintains internal fairness and consistency with the long history practiced by the city to treat all employees equally with respect to annual wage increases. The union offer which would place catch-up increases into effect the last day of the contract year 1992, would result in the increase for 1992 ranging from 5 to 12% as compared to the pattern settlement of 4% to all other employees. The city also argues that deviation from an established settlement pattern would have a chilling effect on voluntary collective bargaining and cause a

ripple effect throughout the city's employees.

The city also contends employees in the Firefighters bargaining unit would be entitled to a windfall increase in addition to their previous settlement at 4% for 1992 by virtue of a "me too clause" contained in the Firefighters labor agreement. They also contend that city budget restrictions would be adversely affected by granting the union's catch-up proposal.

Finally, the city contends there were no tentative agreements reached by the parties during negotiations on any catch-up or lump sum increases.

DISCUSSION:

The union submitted comparative data for the various classifications for which catch-up is proposed to comparable classifications in what the union contends are comparable communities. Union Exhibits #54 through #61 sets forth their comparative data and they are attached as addendums hereto.

The union contends its identification of comparables is the most appropriate. They refer to a finding in a 1983 arbitration between the city and a union representing the city's police department employees by arbitrator Frank Ziedler wherein he determined that the primary group of comparables to the city of Greenfield consisted of the municipalities of Cudahy, Franklin, Greendale, Hales Corners, Oak Creek, St. Francis, South Milwaukee, Wauwatosa, West Allis, West Milwaukee and New Berlin. The union observed that several of the smaller municipalities listed do not have comparable positions to some of the positions for which catch-up is proposed. The union excluded the positions of Code Enforcer and Plumbing Inspector at West Milwaukee as comparables because the Code Enforcer is contracted out and the Plumbing Inspector is part time. The union also excluded the positions of City Engineer, Plumbing Inspector, Public Health Nurse and Engineering Technician in the City of St. Francis for the reason that the Plumbing Inspector is part

time and the Public Health Nurse's duties are performed by an employee in the classification of Administrator, who also acts in the area of environmental health. The union also excluded the classification of Assistant City Engineer for the reason that the City of St. Francis only had a Senior Engineer and had no Assistant City Engineer or Engineering Technician. In addition, no job descriptions were available by which the union could make a comparison as to similarity of job duties.

The employer contends the union's use of external comparisons should be disallowed for several reasons. First, they contend the union has established no foundation that comparisons were made to equivalent positions. The city points out that the union representative acknowledged under questioning that he did not determine the size of the department for any of the positions in the comparable communities, he did not recall whether there had been a determination as to which, if any, of multiple level classifications in a comparable community was equivalent to a compared position in Greenfield, that he had not received the job descriptions of all of the positions supplied for the comparable communities, and acknowledged that he did not have an opinion as to whether those job descriptions were comparable to the Greenfield positions.

The city advanced as a second reason for rejecting the union's list of comparables, the fact that the union had not determined which, if any, of the positions at any of the listed comparables were represented by a union. The city suggests that the comparability data is unreliable and lacks consistency sufficient upon which to base reasonable comparability judgments.

The record evidence includes copies of the various job descriptions in effect for the classifications at issue in this case consisting of Union Exhibits numbered 4,5,6,8,10, 12,13,15 and 18.

The union also submitted Exhibits numbered 64 thru 77

consisting of wage and classification data including job descriptions, where available, for the listed comparables. The union has listed some classifications in the attached comparison data based only on similarity of the job title itself. Job descriptions are included for some of the classifications for some of the communities.

For example, the Code Enforcement Officer classification is compared to only the one other similarly named classification in the City of Brookfield. The union has not listed the classification of Code Enforcer in the City of West Allis. A comparison of the listed job duties set forth in the respective job descriptions confirm its omission on the basis of considerable difference in the listed duties.

Comparison of the Environmental Health Specialist is also subject to minimum comparative data. It is, however, possible to compare job descriptions for the position described as "Sanitarian" in the cities of Wauwatosa and Hales Corners and the classification of Environmentalist I at West Allis to the Greenfield job description. Such comparison indicates that they are comparable positions.

The positions of Plumbing Inspector and Public Health Nurse are more easily identifiable as comparable. The various job descriptions indicate similar duties and responsibilities with their counterparts in the other comparable municipalities.

Evaluation of the background evidence relating to the classifications of Deputy City Assessor, Building Inspector, Assistant City Engineer and Engineering Technician, reveals that the union comparison exhibits numbered 61, 60, 58 and 59 respectively are reasonably and objectively supported as reflecting comparison only to similar classifications in the municipalities indicated. For example, in Union Exhibit #59, the union has made comparison to the rate payable to the Engineering Technician at the level II position at West

Allis to its counterpart at Greenfield. The background data supports such selection as the comparable one.

It must be recognized that a number of the positions at issue in this case do not have a comparable counterpart in the comparable communities. The evidence reveals that the union has made an effort to exclude comparison to positions in other communities where the positions are part time or where the job title differs and job descriptions are not sufficient to determine similarity with a different job title. In the final analysis, the comparative data put forth by the union does have relevance to the issue presented. Said data also supports the conclusion that, for the most part, the pay level afforded comparable positions at comparable communities is higher than that afforded equivalent positions at Greenfield. A comparative analysis to outside comparables is found to support the union's proposal for catch-up increases for those positions indicated.

The second major area of argument addressed to this issue involved the parties positions and proposals put forth during negotiations leading up to the impasse and final offers submitted in this case.

The union pointed out that this is the second contract between the parties. During negotiations on the first contract, the union focused on contract language and informed the city near the end of negotiations that it would be looking for catch-up increases during negotiations on the next contract. During subsequent negotiations on the successor contract the union initially proposed an across the board increase of 9% and presented survey data for similar classifications in comparable communities. The union modified its initial offer consisting of an increase to the various classifications based on a percentage of the difference between the surveyed rate of the comparables and the rate in Greenfield. In January of 1992, the city

submitted a counter proposal including catch-up increases in addition to a general increase to be placed into effect on December 1 of the third year of a three year contract. The parties continued to negotiate on lump sum catch-up amounts for various classifications with each party moving the varying amounts around to different classifications.

The final bargaining session held between the parties was with a mediator on April 28, 1992. At such meeting, the city offered catch-up amounts to the same positions and in the same amounts as the union had last proposed but with the catch-up amounts to be placed into effect on 1/1/93 rather than in December of 1993. Their offer included a wage freeze for the Police Utility position for each of the first two years of the contract. Their offer also included a proposed 4% across the board increase for the third year of the contract.

The union pointed out that subsequent to such last bargaining meeting, the city negotiated and finalized bargaining with other units and a pattern emerged with contracts terminating on December 31, 1992. Both parties thereupon prepared and submitted final offers with two year terms. The union's catch-up proposal is identical to that proposed by the city at the final negotiation session with the exception that it would be placed into effect on December 31, 1992 rather than January 1, 1993. The union has referred to the circumstances that resulted in the union's catch-up final offer being identical as to amounts and positions to which they would be applicable, as "agreement" between the parties during negotiations.

The city strenuously objected to the union's reference to such catch-up proposal as based on any "agreements" or "tentative agreements" between the parties. They contend there were no tentative agreements reached between the parties concerning any lump sum increases at any time during negotiations. The city argued at pp.3-4 of its reply brief,

"As of the date final offers were certified, lump sum wage increases had not been removed from the bargaining table. That is because they had not been agreed upon during bargaining, contrary to the Union's "recollection" as portrayed in its brief.

The Union's left-handed attempt to align with arbitral precedent by way of this aberration was only made necessary by the lack of any substantiation for their demand for lump sum increases on the last day of the contract.

The lump sum increases shown in the City's offers (Union Ex. 21 and 22) were offers made by the City in conjunction with a 3 year agreement. Subsequently, 3 year agreements were taken off of the table by mutual agreement (Union brief, p. 16). The parties weren't 1 day apart they were 1 year apart. The City also proposed a wage freeze for the police department utility person (Tr.:257) and did in fact discuss and bargain in good faith regarding catch-up increases. Unfortunately the Union and the City could not reach agreement (Tr.:258). To cite, reference or even infer that such discussion was improper or somehow represented a "tentative agreement" is a gross misstatement.

The Union goes on to argue that the parties "agreed" to lump sum increases were only one day apart (Union brief, p. 16). Once 3 year agreements were removed from the bargaining table, the differences became much more than that. The City was then faced with not only the financial impact of the lump sum increases to the residual unit employees, but with the potential "ripple effect" throughout the City's employees (who had settled 1992 contracts and were looking ahead to 1993) and to possible future problems arising from the "Me too" clause in the firefighters contract (Tr.:254). The Union would like the arbitrator to believe it was doing the City a favor by proposing its lump sum amounts on the last day of the contract. The union hallucinates that their approach has "the least impact on the City" (Union brief p.8). However, the City is entrusted to provide a wage approach for its entire employee complement. The City had a decision to make based on the City as a whole and they stand firmly behind that decision."

The union disputed the city's contention that the granting of lump sum amounts during the 1991-1992 contract term would cause a ripple effect on other units. They point out that had the city believed that such adjustments to

selected positions would have such effect, it is unlikely that they would have offered them in the first place. The fact that it was in conjunction with a 3 year proposal does not alter such consideration. The offer of the city for such third year included a proposed 4% across-the-board increase in addition to the lump sum adjustments. Their offer of the lump sum amounts wasn't linked with a proposed takeaway in some other area having equivalent value. From such facts it must be assumed that the city agreed with the union that certain catch-up adjustments to selected positions were warranted and justifiable on their own comparative merits.

The union also argued that the city had given lump sum adjustments to other non-represented employees and no identifiable ripple effect was shown as having impacted on other employees or units of employees. Six of 19 non-represented positions have been given lump sum adjustments since 1991. At least three of the six involved the removal of such positions from the residual unit of employees. The union has apparently challenged their removal from the unit and such challenges are still pending in unit clarification petitions.

The union further argued that the "me too" clause contained in the firefighters contract would not impact on the granting of catch-up lump sum increases such as proposed in this case. The firefighters "me too" clause applies only to other voluntary union across-the-board increases. It does not apply to settlements resulting from arbitration and it does not apply to catch-up lump sum increases.

The firefighters "me too" provision states as follows:

"*In the event there is another voluntary union settlement in the City for more than 4% across-the-board increase for 1992, the bargaining unit would receive the same increase."

I agree with the union's contention that the firefighter's "me too" clause would not apply to any catch-up adjustments. Such items are not across-the-board

increases and they are not voluntary by virtue of this arbitral proceedings.

I am likewise not persuaded that the granting of catch-up lump sum salary adjustments would cause a ripple effect on other employees. The justification for granting such type increase is founded in a finding that the level of compensation for a particular job is too low in comparison to others similarly situated and/or justified by the services and responsibilities involved. Such type adjustments are frequently referred to as inequity adjustments. As stated earlier herein, the survey data and comparison to positions similarly situated in comparable communities supports a finding that inequity adjustments such as proposed by the union are justified.

The evidence involving the parties positions during bargaining leads one to the concensus that the city accepted and believed, as did the union, that catch-up adjustments were justified. While their bargaining did not result in any tentative agreement thereon, the union's final offer for adjustments is the same as the one proposed by the city. The fact that the city tied its offer to a 3 year contract rather than a 2 year one, does not detract from the conclusion that both the city and the union were in agreement as to which positions and how much each should be given as inequity adjustments. Only the "when" was at issue as to the catch-up increases.

I would have some difficulty accepting the identical positions of the parties concerning the positions and amounts attributable to each as solely catch-up if the city's proposal thereon had been made in conjunction with some form of requested "quid pro quo" therefor. There does not appear to have been any and I therefore would find that it was proposed by the city based purely on consideration of justification for catch-up increases in and of themselves.

The city contended granting the union's proposed catch-up increases would adversely affect the city's budget

restrictions. While placing them into effect on December 31, 1992, would serve to provide a carry-over to 1993, the cost to the city for the two year period of this contract term would be negligible. I therefore find the city's argument on this aspect to be without merit.

Both the city and the union have addressed the vast majority of their evidence and argument to the "catch-up" issue in this case. It is clear that both consider such issue to be the dominant and controlling one to resolution of the case. The two remaining issues involving, 1) payout of unused sick leave at retirement, and, 2) time of payment of uniform allowance are viewed by both parties as minor. The city stated in its reply brief,

"One can certainly hypothesize that, given the relatively minor nature of the other issues remaining in dispute, that the disagreement on lump sum wage increases has single-handedly put the final offers before the Arbitrator."

The union's proposal concerning payout of unused sick leave at retirement is the same as is currently in effect for all other city represented employee units and unrepresented employees, with the exception of the firefighters. It is therefore to be favored on the basis of such comparison. The city expressed its intention to negotiate reduction of such benefit to the level of its proposal with other units. If they do so, it would seem to follow that they would then have the best of the argument that the residual unit should be the same as the majority of other city employees and that the tail should not wave the dog. As of this point in time, however, the union's proposal on the retirement issue is supported by the dog and tail principle.

The city proposed that the annual uniform allowance be issued the second pay period in January. Their reasons for such proposal were based on administrative needs. The present requirement that it be issued with the first payroll check of the year creates an excess work load at a time when

the accounting department is extremely busy with year end reports, W-2's, etc. The union's acceptance of the city's proposal would be a reasonable accommodation of the city's needs. Comparison to internal comparisons also favors the city's proposal.

I find the city's arguments on such issue to have more support in the evidence and considerations bearing thereon and for such reason is favored as the more reasonable.

In conclusion, the arbitrator is of the considered judgment that the union's final offer is subject to the greater support by virtue of the record evidence and application of the relevant statutory factors thereto. Catch-up adjustments are found to be supported by both internal and external comparative considerations that are referenced in the statutory factors. I find factor j. to be particularly applicable to consideration of the catch-up issue. One can easily presume that had the parties continued to negotiate to a final settlement, catch-up increases would have been a part of such voluntary settlement and that they would have been similar, if not identical, to those proposed by the city in bargaining and by the union in its final offer. I find the one day difference in the proposed effective date thereof to be of little relevance.

It therefore follows from the above facts and discussion thereon that the undersigned issues the following decision and,

AWARD:

The final offer of the Union is chosen as the terms of the issues in dispute to be incorporated into the 1991-1992 labor agreement.

Dated April 30, 1993.


Robert S. Mueller

POSITION: PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Final Offer	26,637.46	28,271.78
Union's Final Offer	26,637.46	28,271.78
OAK CREEK	25,045.00	29,268.00
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD		
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		26,997.60
GREENDALE	25,429.00	34,405.00
FRANKLIN		28,766.40
WEST ALLIS	27,060.80	29,390.40
SOUTH MILWAUKEE	25,118.34	28,340.00
CUDAHY	19,843.20	27,030.72

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Final Offer	27,702.96	29,402.65
Union's Final Offer as of 12-31-92	28,202.96	29,902.65
OAK CREEK	25,045.00	37,354.00
WAUWATOSA	28,481.44	33,521.02
BROOKFIELD		
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		28,329.60
GREENDALE	26,721.00	36,153.00
FRANKLIN		
WEST ALLIS	28,412.80	31,491.20
SOUTH MILWAUKEE	26,374.14	29,757.00
CUDAHY	NOT SETTLED	

POSITION: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST - FULL TIME

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	25,454.30	27,448.41
Union's Offer	26,637.46	28,271.78
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA ⁰⁰		
BROOKFIELD		
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS ⁰⁰		27,144.00
GREENDALE ⁰⁰		
FRANKLIN		
WEST ALLIS		29,369.60
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	26,472.47	28,546.35
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	28,202.96	29,902.65
OAK REEK		
WAUWATOSA ⁰⁰	28,481.44	33,521.02
BROOKFIELD		
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS ⁰⁰		28,225.60
GREENDALE ⁰⁰		
FRANKLIN		
WEST ALLIS		30,700.80
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
ELM GROVE		

(1) Sanitarian

POSITION: CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	\$10.43 per hour	\$10.84 per hour
Union's Offer	\$10.43 per hour	\$10.84 per hour
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	27,155.00 (\$13.06 per hour)	33,943.00 (\$16.32 per hour)
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		\$11.75 per hour
WEST ALLIS		
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	\$10.85 per hour	\$11.27 per hour
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	\$11.25 per hour	\$11.67 per hour
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	27,969.00 (\$13.45 per hour)	34,961.00 (\$16.81 per hour)
NEW BERLIN		
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		
WEST ALLIS		
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

POSITION: PLUMBING INSPECTOR - FULL TIME

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	28,543.18	31,714.64
Union's Offer	28,543.18	31,714.64
OAK CREEK	28,895.00	40,342.00
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	31,966.00	39,957.00
NEW BERLIN	31,179.20	34,278.40
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		33,280.00
WEST ALLIS		33,030.40
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	29,684.91	32,983.23
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	30,934.91	34,233.23
OAK CREEK	28,895.0	31,258.24 (40,342.00)*
WAUWATOSA	32,981.00	38,785.24
BROOKFIELD	32,925.00	41,156.00
NEW BERLIN	32,760.00	36,004.80
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		34,008.00
WEST ALLIS		34,507.20

* corrected rate

POSITION: ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	33,587.78	37,319.74
Union's Offer	33,587.78	37,319.74
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	34,203.00	42,755.00
NEW BERLIN ⁽¹⁾	36,077.00	46,899.00
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE	29,233.00	39,551.00
FRANKLIN		45,302.40
WEST ALLIS		
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	34,931.29	38,812.53
Union's Offer as of 12-31/92	36,431.29	40,312.53
OAK CREEK	41,500.00	46,000.00
WAUWATOSA	48,728.94	57,320.38
BROOKFIELD	35,229.00	44,037.00
NEW BERLIN ⁽¹⁾	37,159.00	48,306.00
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE	33,242.00	44,974.00
FRANKLIN		47,099.94
WEST ALLIS		
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

(1) Division Engineer

POSITION: ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	23,748.36	26,387.06
Union's Offer	23,748.36	26,387.06
OAK CREEK	25,292.80	29,473.60
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	27,155.00	33,943.00
NEW BERLIN (4 LEVELS)	17,513.60	34,278.40
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		28,974.40
WEST ALLIS	23,649.60	26,249.60
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY	26,395.20	34,396.92

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	24,698.29	27,442.52
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	26,198.28	28,942.54
OAK CREEK	26,823.68	31,258.24
WAUWATOSA	32,981.00	38,785.24
BROOKFIELD	27,969.00	34,961.00
NEW BERLIN (4 LEVELS)	18,387.20	36,004.80
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		30,139.20
WEST ALLIS	24,710.40	27,435.20
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY	NOT SETTLED	

POSITION: BUILDING INSPECTOR
(formerly Assistant Building Inspector)

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Final Offer	22,325.85	26,774.09
Union's Offer	22,325.85	26,774.09
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	27,155.00	33,943.00
NEW BERLIN	28,745.60	31,595.20
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		27,164.80
WEST ALLIS	34,590.40	43,243.20
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	23,218.88	27,845.05
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	25,218.88	29,845.05
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	27,969.00	34,961.00
NEW BERLIN	30,180.80	33,196.80
MUSKEGO	29,120.00	31,969.60
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN		29,369.60
WEST ALLIS	36,316.80	45,406.40
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

POSITION: DEPUTY CITY ASSESSOR

1991

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	29,402.49	32,669.43
Union's Offer	29,402.49	32,669.43
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA		
BROOKFIELD	31,966.00	39,957.00
NEW BERLIN	28,745.60	31,595.20
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN ⁽¹⁾		26,520.00
WEST ALLIS	34,236.80	42,785.60
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

1992

	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
City's Offer	30,578.59	33,976.21
Union's Offer as of 12-31-92	31,078.59	34,476.21
OAK CREEK		
WAUWATOSA	27,131.78	31,923.58
BROOKFIELD	32,925.00	41,156.00
NEW BERLIN	30,180.80	33,196.80
MUSKEGO		
HALES CORNERS		
GREENDALE		
FRANKLIN ⁽¹⁾		27,580.80
WEST ALLIS	35,921.60	44,907.20
SOUTH MILWAUKEE		
CUDAHY		

(1) Appraiser